

Los Rios District Matriculation & Student Success Committee

Monday, February 27, 2017

District Office Main Conference Room

2:30pm-4:30pm

Minutes

Members Attending: **Judy Mays** (Chair), **Sue Lorimer** (Administrative Liaison), **Deb Luff** (VPSS Representative -SCC), **Melanie Dixon** (VPSS Representative – FLC), **Jessica Nelson** (Counseling Rep – ARC), **Tera Diggs-Reynolds** (Non-Counseling Faculty/Local Co-Chair – ARC), **John Hess** (Non-Counseling Faculty/Local Co-Chair – ARC), **Jerome Lahey** (Classified Matriculation Rep – ARC), **Kathy Degn** (Non-Counseling Faculty/Local Chair – CRC), **Tadael Emiru** (Matriculation Coordinator – CRC), **Richard Andrews** (Classified Matriculation Rep – CRC), **Genevieve Siwabessy** (Interim Matriculation Coordinator – FLC), **Tucker Zurawski** (FLC – Student representative), **Leila Stone** (Counseling Rep – SCC), **Karen Tercho** (Non-Counseling Faculty/Local Chair rep – SCC), **Irina Marsant** (Classified Matriculation Rep – SCC).

Members Not in Attendance: **Victoria Rosario** (Administrative Liaison), **Salena Mamuyac** (Assessment Rep), **Christine Thomas** (Matriculation Coordinator – ARC), **Camile Moreno** (Non-Counseling Faculty Rep – CRC), **Howell Ellerman** (Non-Counseling Faculty Rep – FLC), **Mark Garrett** (Counseling Rep – FLC), **Molly Springer** (Matriculation Coordinator – SCC).

- I. **Call to order** – The meeting was called to order at 2:34pm.
- II. **Approval of agenda** – There were no additions to the agenda; approved by consensus.
- III. **Approval of minutes for January 23, 2017** – There was one correction to the minutes. Irina Marsant clarified wording regarding the Common Assessment Initiative under the Administrator’s Report. According to Irina, SCC will be piloting the Common Assessment and working with the District to coordinate a single sign-on. The minutes were approved by consensus as corrected.
- IV. **Public comments** – None.
- V. **Introductions** – None.
- VI. **Administrator’s report** – Sue Lorimer reported that the District Technology Plan was approved by the Board of Trustees at their meeting on February 8th. The plan includes both scheduling software and software for what is being called the student experience lifecycle. Sue is responsible for putting together a timeline for the entire process. Each college in the district will be responsible for assembling their own internal team for each project. The District will also have a team and a representative from each college team will attend district wide meetings. The college teams will focus on determining the purpose of the software and the desired outcomes. The college teams will also determine the criteria for selection of a product. Colleges will use their own discretion in assembling their teams. Sue noted that the college presidents on each campus will be responsible for communicating to the entire college what is going on with the project. The District Vice Chancellor of Public Information will also send updates to keep everyone informed about the progress. The plan is to also provide opportunities for a broader audience to get a demonstration of the products.
- VII. **Chair’s report** – No report.
- VIII. **Action items** – There were no action items.

IX. Discussion items

a. **Email message to students regarding Incomplete grades** – Written comments collected by Academic Senate presidents at each campus were reviewed by the Committee. The majority of the comments were supportive of the communication and only one comment was non supportive. Some comments were questions which Committee members provided feedback on and Judy will forward typewritten responses to the Academic Senate presidents. Richard Andrews volunteered to get further information on whether the term and year could be added along with the professors last name and first initial and if the message can contain cumulative information (i.e. include information for multiple Incomplete grades). Judy will also work with Richard to get the email revised with the grammatical edits.

b. **Probation & Dismissal Practices** – reports on campus level review of matrix and alignment or non-alignment with district regulations:

ARC – ARC has not placed holds on Probation 1 or Probation 2 students in 12 or so years. Intervention efforts have been primarily focused on dismissed students. Currently students on probation are emailed a letter that invites them to participate in a workshop—Strive to Thrive; however, it is not mandatory. Jessica Nelson reporting on behalf of ARC feels they need to do more for students on P1 and P2 and there is also an interest in targeting students whose GPA falls below a 2.0 even if they have not attempted 12 units.

CRC – Probation 1 and 2 students receive an email notifying them of their status and places a hold on their record. Students must meet with a SSSP Specialist and attend a workshop. The workshop includes a counseling component. Future plans include reaching out to students who are borderline (2.1 or 2.2 GPA) to provide assistance before they get on probation. CRC has about 1,200 students on probation but only focus on those currently enrolled (approx 800). SSSP Specialists take the lead in working with this population. Some incentives are used to reach out to disproportionately impacted groups (i.e. gas cards, food, etc.). CRC's practices are in alignment with district regulations for serving students on Probation 1. District regulations outlining intervention strategies for students on Probation 2 currently do not include placing a hold on student's records.

FLC – Holds are placed on Probation 1 and Probation 2 students and they must participate in mandatory interventions. FLC practices are out of alignment with district regulations with regards to the timeline for dismissed students to petition to be readmitted. FLC currently takes petitions for readmission up to the start of the semester. See attached data on the PASS program at FLC.

SCC – Holds are placed on Probation 1 students and they must participate in Fresh Start workshops. Students on Probation 2 do not get a hold placed on their records, but they receive an email offering them the opportunity to participate in success coaching. Dismissed students do not attend a workshop—they go directly to a counselor to find out what they must do. SCC practices are currently in alignment with district regulations.

Questions and concerns raised during the discussion:

Why is there a 10 day advance notice required for petitions to be readmitted? What are the rates of success based on when students petitioned to be readmitted?

What happens when a student on probation with a hold on their record which was placed by one college, tries to enroll at a different campus? Colleges have agreed to a shared practice of avoiding sending the student pack to the campus where the hold was placed. However, the new college the student is attending has discretion to require that the student participate in services at that campus. The campus that placed the hold will release the hold once the new campus communicates that the student has fulfilled requirements for any interventions (i.e. workshop, meeting with a counselor, etc.).

Why do we not have the same practices for all four colleges? The issue is primarily staffing.

Are dismissed students required to sit out for one semester?

Regarding district regulations, it appears that the areas where campus level practices are not in alignment are with placing holds on probation 2 students and adhering to the deadline of petitioning for readmission 10 days prior to the start of the semester. Committee members felt it would be prudent to review and examine Regulation 2231 in its entirety to ensure that current regulations are consistent with the goals of the Student Success and Support Program initiative. Judy will forward a copy of the regulations to each member for review and discussion at the next meeting.

- c. **Lack of student access to eServices between 11:30pm and 7:00am** – As a result of the discussion of this topic at the last meeting, District IT made the decision to conduct a one week pilot of an earlier start time and opened the system at 5:00a.m during the week of February 13th. The pilot went well and as of February 21st the system is now open and available to students starting at 5:00am. It was again noted that the purpose of the down time is for the IT department to run various reports on the system. It was also noted that this additional time may not meet the needs of all students; however, the increase in hours of operation is still an improvement.

X. **Next meeting:** March 20, 2017, Main Conference Room

XI. **Adjournment** – The meeting was adjourned at 4:30pm.

Respectfully Submitted:
Judy Mays